

# **EMPG Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday, November 10, 2011**

**1000-1500**

**State Operations Center, EOC, Austin**

## **In Attendance**

- Members: Joe Ferro (Chairman/City of Webster); Pat McMacken (Co-Chair City of Irving); Tim Ocnaschek (Secretary/City of Beaumont), Larry Trevino (City of San Antonio); Sarah Somers (Grayson County); Chuck Frazier (Brazos County); Frank Patterson (City of Waco); Dale Little (Midland County); Judge Joe English (Nacogdoches County); David Coatney (City of Round Rock); Michelle Carrahan (Harris County); Kevin Starbuck (City of Amarillo); Ricardo Gonzalez (City of El Paso); Jose Ortiz (City of Fort Worth); Danielle Hale (Nueces County); Billy Smith (Jasper/Newton/Sabine Counties)
- Liaisons: Shari Ramirez-MacKay (TDEM); Lisa Resendez (TDEM); Doris Grisham (TDEM); Mike George (SAA); Raoul Rivera (TDEM)

## **Meeting Recap**

Overview of discussion topics:

- Reviewed governance principle of consensus vs motions and voting. Agreed to use consensus.
- Discussed the percentages for each category of the proposed funding formula.
- SAA, Mike George, addressed the impending funding formula for state distribution of Homeland Security funds and volunteered to return next meeting to provide a 10-15 minute briefing on the formula criterion since it is nearing finalization and could be useful in further EMPG funding formula development.

Key concerns included:

- More objective guidance for developing the hazard analysis reflected in the Basic Plan. Some FEMA guidance is in draft stage and may assist in the near future and Danielle Hale (Nueces County) has submitted some tentative measures that could also be discussed in the future.
- Major funding changes at the end of year can really cause budget problems. Jurisdictions benefit from incremental reductions, such as the 15% cap utilized in 2011 awards.
- The funding formula has incorrect plan-based population amounts which prevents accurate calculations

Decisions made: (Recommendations)

- A Baseline recommendation will be submitted. This threshold was calculated to ensure new jurisdictions have incentive to apply and be included, as well as to represent a portion of the anticipated costs of developing and maintaining a jurisdictional Emergency Operations Plan. To allow for unknown future award amounts, the committee's recommendation is to take 40% of EMPG funding passed through the state and divide that amount by the number of eligible EMPG jurisdictions. Annual EMPG eligible budgets will be assessed to ensure the federally directed 50% match is sufficient to cover the Baseline award. Any overage will be included with the remaining 60% of EMPG pass-through funding.
- EMPG eligibility will be determined as previously agreed upon. New applicants having completed a successful probationary year will be rolled into the total number of eligible applicants.
- Recommend a three-step EMPG funding process:
  - Determine the Baseline and calculate overages based on eligible budget
  - Add any overage to the remaining pass-through funding
  - All jurisdictions with budgets adequate to receive funding over the baseline will be entered into the formula to calculate additional allocation
- Formula includes the following funding percentages:
  - Progress reports and compliance will be added back to the formula at a 20% level for those jurisdictions scoring between 15-25 points. Those dropping below 15 points at the end of the year would be ineligible for any funding that year, and the money would be put back into the pass-through total to be re-distributed.
  - Population specific to Plan coverage area was given a 70% rating.
  - Threat/Risk will continue to provide a 10% impact until more objective guidance is provided to justify the rankings.
  - Budget was given 0% impact in the current funding calculation. There was concern that since budget reflects population, risk and other factors, adding budget and population to the formula would create duplication. A number of jurisdictions are only reporting enough costs to cover the anticipated EMPG award and a little leeway instead of complete program costs. If full program costs were submitted, there was concern the funding formula could be skewed.

Issues requiring further discussion at next meeting:

- Review the outcome and impacts of the revised formula factors.
- Review of SAA funding formula as relating to future EMPG formula development.

## **Assignments**

---

<b>Item</b>	<b>Assigned to:</b>	<b>Date due:</b>
Invite Mike George (SAA) to next meeting	Lisa and Joe	11-18-2011
Set next meeting date	Lisa	11-18-2011

Send EMPG members the updated and revised funding formula sheet for review and discussion prior to next meeting	Lisa and Joe	When possible (NLT 2wks prior to meeting)

## **Next Meeting**

---

Date/time:

- January TBD/ 1000-1500

Location:

- State Operations Center (SOC)

Past meeting Decisions:

June 27

- Committee rules and guidance approved
- New Applicants will be required to demonstrate full eligible program compliance for one full year with no funding, after which the eligible jurisdiction will be considered on an equitable basis with every other previously approved jurisdiction
- Committee support for jurisdictional EMPG audits have been recorded in previous minutes. Application and budget review process as well as periodic audits and currently published standards should encourage strict adherence to program eligibility requirements.
- Redemption process if removed from award eligibility:
  - If the reason is intentional misconduct (particularly Fraudulent), the jurisdiction is not eligible for five years at which time they will have to reapply as a new applicant (See “new applicant request guidelines)
  - If the reason is non-compliance (forced), or inability to comply (voluntary), then not eligible to apply for one year and then start as a new applicant.

May 31

- TDEM/EMPG program management should be supported in enforcing current EMPG guidance regarding compliance. Additionally, at the 30 day past due mark, a formal letter will be submitted to the Chief Elected Official, CEO (i.e. City Manager), EMC, and relevant RLO
- Committee recommends adjusting guidance wording regarding eligibility to remove “generally”. Jurisdictions in non-compliance should automatically lose funding for the non-compliant periods as well as lose funding the following year.
- Hardship waivers may be relevant for extraordinary circumstances (i.e. disaster) and will require a written extension request from the chief elected official. TDEM staff will review and assess the waivers on a case-by-case basis.